

COMPARISON OF GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD AND ECLECTIC METHOD IN ENHANCING STUDENTS' VOCABULARY ACHIEVEMENT

Caroline V Katemba, Grace Hulu, Nelson Panjaitan

Department of English Education, Universitas Advent Indonesia, Bandung,
Indonesia

ABSTRACT: In teaching language there are some factors that should be considered in order to make the teaching learning process work and reach the success. The teacher should know how to make the language teaching effective, who the learners are, the method and technique that is suitable with the need of the learners and the condition of the classroom. Due to the reason above, this study entitled "Comparison of Grammar Translation method and Eclectic Method in Enhancing Students Vocabulary Achievement" was employed to investigate and examine their difference in teaching vocabulary to the early students.

The participants involved in this study were grade 4 students of Karyawangi Elementary School Parongpong Bandung. This study has three major activities that were involved. They were: Pretest, implementation of Grammar Translation method and Eclectic Method and post test. The participants were commanded to answer the multiple choice test in pre test and post test. During the implementation, the participants were taught vocabulary by using the different method for each group.

This research obtained data follows: $n_1=27$, $n_2=33$, $\alpha=0.05$, mean difference of Grammar Translation Method was 19.22 where mean difference for the Eclectic group was 22.29. After the treatment it was obtained that the mean of post test of Grammar group were 57.14 and for the Eclectic group the mean of post test were 60.21.

From mean of gain of the post test result (The result show that $t_{\text{observed}} > t_{\text{table}}$: $2.9 > 1.645$), it can be concluded that the mean of gain of Eclectic group is higher than the mean of Grammar Translation Method students' vocabulary achievement and Eclectic method students' vocabulary achievement.

Nowadays, the mastery of English competence is needed in facing the globalizations era. That makes the government of Indonesia do some efforts. One of them is by promoting English as a local content at elementary school, to start the proficiency of English from the early age. In line with it, Krashen and Scarcella (1982) stated that acquirers who begin learning a language in early childhood through natural exposure achieve higher proficiency than those beginning as adults.

Thompson and Wyatt (2003) wrote that there are three main stages of learning English. They are the early stage, middle stage and high stage. The early stage begins with hearing and speaking practice, leads on to reading (mostly oral), and then to writing the language lessons are drawn up on a grammatical plan, but little or no theoretical / formal grammar is taught.

This research concentrates in teaching English in early stage because: (1)

The early vocabulary will naturally contain a fair proportion of the most essential parts of speech for sentence making Thompson,(2003). (2) The pupil should be early familiarized with

the introductory question words at an early age. (3) Vocabulary being more easily impressed, being more vivid and more easily remembered than more connection with the visible can be readily made. (4) The lesson also gains interest in young pupil and admits of the avoidance of the vernacular as a means of interpretation to a very considerable extent. (5) A child tends to learn a second language relatively quickly Godner, (1972). (6) Young learners have innumerable virtues (value & Feunteun, in Medina). (7) Children acquire language through a subconscious process during which they are unaware of grammatical rules, similar to the way they acquire their 1st language (Judide Hannes). (8) Children have a lot of natural curiosity. (9) Children exercise a good deal of both cognitive and affective effort in order to internalize both native and second language.

From the description above the researcher chooses this study to examine the comparison of achievement of the students who were taught by using Eclectic Method and Grammar Translation Method in learning vocabulary.

Brown (1994) stated that words are basic building blocks of language, so word is the first order of business. In relating to the importance of vocabulary in learning a new language, vocabulary can be one of the factors that determine someone to be successful in learning the language. This study is intended to find out the comparison of Eclectic method and Grammar Translation method in enhancing students' vocabulary achievement.

Formulation of the problems is stated in the following questions: Is there any significant difference in the vocabulary achievement of the students who are using Grammar Translation method and Eclectic method?

METHODOLOGY

This study was a quantitative research. The improvements between pre test and post test was compared. The result was used to draw the conclusion to the purpose of the study.

The Participants

The participants of this study were grade IV-A students as the GTM group and grade IV-B students as the Eclectic group of SDN Karyawangi Parongpong Bandung.

The researcher chose fourth grade students in her observation with an assumption that fourth grade students were beginners in learning English, so their English lesson still emphasized on vocabulary mastery and it was appropriate for the study.

Research Instrument

The Instrument that was used in gathering the data was vocabulary test. A vocabulary test which served as the research instrument was designed and used to compare the achievement of the students of eclectic method and grammar translation method.

The test was given to the students at the beginning of the research and at the end of the research in order to find out whether or not the students who were taught by an eclectic method and the students who were taught by a grammar translation method have made progress in their vocabulary achievement.

The pre-test and the post-test consisted of 30 items and designed in the form of multiple choice tests.

Data Gathering

In gathering the data, the following procedures were done:

1. Pilot testing.

Before the test used as the research instrument the researcher did the pilot testing first to measure whether the test was reliable and valid. The first pilot testing was administered on January 13 2007 to the Grade 4 students of UNAI Lab school Parongpong Bandung. The total of the respondent were 16 and it was administered in one hour.

The second pilot testing was administered to grade IV students of Kartika XIII-4 Elementary School Parongpong Bandung on March 6 2007. The total of respondent were 60 and were divided into two groups it was administered in one hour.

II. Pre test

The pre test was administered on February 1 2007. It is consisted of 30 items and designed in the form of multiple choices. It was administered to students of grade IV A as the GTM group and grade IV B as the Eclectic Group of Karyawangi Elementary School Parongpong for one hour.

III. Actual Research.

Treatment Session

The treatment was done with procedures as follows:

A. For the Implementation of GTM Group

1. The teacher gave a text in each meeting in accordance with the topics.
2. The students read the text and tried to translate it into Indonesian.
3. The teacher explained the grammar analysis.
4. The vocabularies were given in the form of list.
5. the students were commanded to memorize it.

B. For the Implementation of Eclectic

1. The instructions were presented with the integration of four basics skills of teaching.
2. The teacher presented the materials by using the different techniques in each meeting in accordance with the topics the students' need and the condition of the class.

The sample of the activity was the following:

Topics: Human Body

Lesson steps were the following:

1. The students were given the text.
2. The students tried to translate into the native language.
3. The students were given the human body picture and wrote the name of the body parts.
4. The students learned a song "My eyes, my ears, my nose, my mouth" and practiced the body gestures.
5. The students did the puzzle.
6. The students did the matching.
7. The students were given the vocabularies list.
8. the students were commanded to memorize them.

(For the details see the appendices)

IV. Post Test

The post test was administered on April 9 2007 to measure the improvements of students'

vocabulary ability after the treatment. The result of post test showed the improvement of the students.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To examine the reliability of the test, the researcher did it by using split half reliability and the result was $\alpha = 0.9661$ and 0.9618 and based on the criteria it was classified into the very high category as a result, and it could be used as the research instrument. The table I on the next page showed the reliability analysis scale (alpha), scale mean if item deleted, scale variance if item deleted, corrected item-total correlation, squared multiple correlation and alpha if item deleted of the instrument.

Table 1. Reliability Analysis for the Instrument

| Variable | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Squared Multiple Correlation | Alpha If Item Deleted |
|----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 85.2941 | 2185.8503 | 0.9929 | 0.00 | 0.9589 |
| 2 | 86.1765 | 2251.6649 | 0.9833 | 0.00 | 0.9581 |
| 3 | 84.3235 | 2201.8012 | 0.9929 | 0.00 | 0.9586 |
| 4 | 85.5294 | 2314.3779 | 0.9809 | 0.00 | 0.9577 |
| 5 | 85.3529 | 2200.9020 | 0.9932 | 0.00 | 0.9586 |
| 6 | 85.2059 | 2562.1684 | 0.8744 | 0.00 | 0.9598 |
| 7 | 84.6765 | 2624.0473 | 0.6764 | 0.00 | 0.9611 |
| 8 | 85.5588 | 2573.5873 | 0.8241 | 0.00 | 0.9601 |
| 9 | 85.6765 | 2609.3770 | 0.6348 | 0.00 | 0.9594 |
| 10 | 85.2353 | 2527.2157 | 0.8764 | 0.00 | 0.9591 |
| 11 | 84.8235 | 2500.8770 | 0.8722 | 0.00 | 0.9578 |
| 12 | 84.7059 | 2369.8806 | 0.9707 | 0.00 | 0.9611 |
| 13 | 85.3259 | 2613.3868 | 0.6473 | 0.00 | 0.9603 |
| 14 | 85.5000 | 2573.7727 | 0.7694 | 0.00 | 0.9590 |
| 15 | 85.2353 | 2506.7914 | 0.9041 | 0.00 | 0.9607 |
| 16 | 85.8235 | 2588.3316 | 0.6860 | 0.00 | 0.9602 |
| 17 | 85.7059 | 2572.0927 | 0.7909 | 0.00 | 0.9629 |
| 18 | 85.1471 | 2690.5535 | 0.1396 | 0.00 | 0.9598 |
| 19 | 85.1765 | 2545.0588 | 0.8023 | 0.00 | 0.9617 |
| 20 | 85.2941 | 2490.8806 | 0.8994 | 0.00 | 0.9603 |
| 21 | 85.5588 | 2646.5570 | 0.5172 | 0.00 | 0.9619 |
| 22 | 84.6471 | 2588.6595 | 0.8237 | 0.00 | 0.9603 |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|-----------|---------|------|--------|
| 23 | 85.5588 | 2643.5873 | 0.4423 | 0.00 | 0.9619 |
| 24 | 85.2059 | 2505.5018 | 0.8365 | 0.00 | 0.9593 |
| 25 | 85.4412 | 2629.0419 | 0.5649 | 0.00 | 0.9614 |
| 26 | 84.8235 | 2750.3316 | -0.4101 | 0.00 | 0.9644 |
| 27 | 85.6765 | 2681.6194 | 0.2292 | 0.00 | 0.9626 |
| 28 | 85.0294 | 2672.5143 | 0.2872 | 0.00 | 0.9626 |
| 29 | 85.2647 | 2686.2611 | 0.2080 | 0.00 | 0.9626 |
| 30 | 84.9706 | 2671.7870 | 0.3424 | 0.00 | 0.9626 |

Table 2. Standardize item alpha

| Alpha | Standardized item alpha |
|--------|-------------------------|
| 0.9618 | 0.9612 |

Table 3. Reliability Analysis for the Instrument

| Variable | Scale Mean if Item Deleted | Scale Variance if Item Deleted | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Squared Multiple Correlation | Alpha If Item Deleted |
|----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 86.7742 | 2057.4473 | 0.9932 | 0.00 | 0.9638 |
| 2 | 87.2258 | 2219.2473 | 0.9138 | 0.00 | 0.9632 |
| 3 | 85.8387 | 2073.0731 | 0.9957 | 0.00 | 0.9635 |
| 4 | 86.8710 | 2122.5161 | 0.6877 | 0.00 | 0.9629 |
| 5 | 86.8710 | 2123.2495 | 0.9919 | 0.00 | 0.9629 |
| 6 | 86.5806 | 2446.2516 | 0.5519 | 0.00 | 0.9660 |
| 7 | 86.190 | 2365.7828 | 0.8680 | 0.00 | 0.9642 |
| 8 | 86.4149 | 2270.1849 | 0.9356 | 0.00 | 0.9631 |
| 9 | 87.5161 | 2467.2581 | 0.4056 | 0.00 | 0.9665 |
| 10 | 86.9355 | 2385.3957 | 0.7687 | 0.00 | 0.9648 |
| 11 | 85.9032 | 2280.4237 | 0.9344 | 0.00 | 0.9632 |
| 12 | 86.0645 | 2206.6624 | 0.9781 | 0.00 | 0.9626 |
| 13 | 86.5806 | 2483.6516 | 0.2743 | 0.00 ~ | 0.9669 |
| 14 | 86.8710 | 2457.5161 | 0.5294 | 0.00 | 0.9661 |
| 15 | 86.6744 | 2443.9591 | 0.5994 | 0.00 | 0.9658 |
| 16 | 87.8065 | 2387.3613 | 0.8429 | 0.00 | 0.9646 |
| 17 | 87.3226 | 2398.1591 | 0.7777 | 0.00 | 0.9649 |
| 18 | 86.7097 | 2371.5462 | 0.8504 | 0.00 | 0.9643 |
| 19 | 86.9032 | 2404.1570 | 0.7190 | 0.00 | 0.9651 |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|-----------|--------|------|--------|
| 20 | 86.9677 | 2258.9556 | 0.3774 | 0.00 | 0.9630 |
| 21 | 86.7742 | 2479.5140 | 0.9239 | 0.00 | 0.9666 |
| 22 | 85.9355 | 2349.9290 | 0.5350 | 0.00 | 0.9639 |
| 23 | 86.8710 | 2441.1161 | 0.6280 | 0.00 | 0.9660 |
| 24 | 87.1935 | 2417.3613 | 0.7601 | 0.00 | 0.9655 |
| 25 | 86.9677 | 2368.6989 | -0.189 | 0.00 | 0.9646 |
| 26 | 86.6452 | 2518.9032 | 0.7190 | 0.00 | 0.9677 |
| 27 | 86.9355 | 2493.5290 | 0.3774 | 0.00 | 0.9671 |
| 28 | 86.6452 | 2480.8366 | 0.2965 | 0.00 | 0.9668 |
| 29 | 86.2129 | 2498.5118 | 0.1827 | 0.00 | 0.9672 |
| 30 | 86.0323 | 2399.5656 | 0.8349 | 0.00 | 0.648 |

Table 4. Standardize item alpha

| Alpha | Standardized item alpha |
|--------|-------------------------|
| 0.9661 | 0.9644 |

Based on the criteria:

$\alpha > 0.9$ – *excellent*

$\alpha > 0.8$ – *good*

$\alpha > 0.7$ – *acceptable*

$\alpha > 0.6$ – *questionable*

$\alpha > 0.5$ – *poor*

$\alpha > 0.4$ – *unacceptable*

It can be seen from the table above that the instrument or the questionnaire were excellent as it was proven from the $\alpha = 0.9618$ and $\alpha = 0.9661$

2.1 Data Gathering

In collecting the data, the researcher used the following procedures conducting Pre test: The researcher gave a multiple choice test which was consisted of 30 items and administered to students 60 students. Applying the treatment: The researcher gave the different implementations for each group: Grammar Translation Method for grammar group and implementation of Eclectic method to the Eclectic group. Conducting Post test: After the treatments, the researcher conducted a post test and used the same procedures as the pre test. The post test was administered to 60 students scoring: The score was given based on the participants' correct answer. The perfect score was 100 interpreting the score: The researcher used t-test to find the significance difference between pre and post test.

Table 5. GTM Achievment

| No | Name | Pre Test | Post Test |
|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| 1 | Bobby M | 46 | 40 |
| 2 | Feggy | 33 | 46 |
| 3 | Ferdy | 43 | 40 |
| 4 | Alby | 43 | 66 |
| 5 | Didin | 50 | 50 |
| 6 | Wildan | 33 | 40 |
| 7 | Harisman | 30 | 43 |
| 8 | Lia | 63 | 80 |
| 9 | Dayusman | 23 | 73 |
| 10 | Herlin | 30 | 46 |
| 11 | Tyas | 30 | 50 |
| 12 | Fidia | 43 | 56 |
| 13 | Findry | 33 | 66 |
| 14 | Fitria | 33 | 56 |
| 15 | Meysiska | 33 | 40 |
| 16 | Karina | 23 | 56 |
| 17 | Diah | 43 | 56 |
| 18 | Sanggra | 43 | 66 |
| 19 | Dwi | 43 | 66 |
| 20 | Allan | 46 | 63 |
| 21 | Ryan | 46 | 73 |
| 22 | Aas | 36 | 60 |
| 23 | Melvin | 46 | 63 |
| 24 | Cici | 43 | 56 |
| 25 | Igbal | 23 | 60 |
| 26 | Vivi | 23 | 66 |
| 27 | Faisal | 43 | 66 |
| Total | | 1024 | 1543 |
| Mean | | 37.92 | 57.14 |
| Mean Difference | | 19.22 | |

Table 6. Eclectic Achievement

| No | Name | Pre Test | Post Test |
|----|-------|----------|-----------|
| 1 | Rudy | 40 | 76 |
| 2 | Dini | 53 | 63 |
| 3 | Siti | 30 | 40 |
| 4 | Citra | 26 | 63 |
| 5 | Asep | 36 | 83 |
| 6 | Wina | 30 | 36 |
| 7 | Reza | 36 | 40 |
| 8 | Tita | 23 | 53 |
| 9 | Irma | 23 | 30 |

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| 10 | Darlina | 46 | 80 |
| 11 | Agni | 46 | 76 |
| 12 | Indry | 46 | 83 |
| 13 | Melati | 40 | 83 |
| 14 | Wulan | 40 | 60 |
| 15 | Rhendy | 40 | 70 |
| 16 | Hery | 20 | 63 |
| 17 | Rudy | 63 | 63 |
| 18 | Helsa | 60 | 70 |
| 19 | Darina | 53 | 63 |
| 20 | Siti Kurnia | 40 | 53 |
| 21 | Nepi | 30 | 53 |
| 22 | Yani | 33 | 76 |
| 23 | Aditya | 36 | 50 |
| 24 | Naftiri | 43 | 50 |
| 25 | Dindin | 43 | 80 |
| 26 | Yoga | 43 | 46 |
| 27 | Cecep Maulana | 36 | 43 |
| 28 | Yadi | 30 | 36 |
| 29 | Deni K | 31 | 63 |
| 30 | Angga | 53 | 63 |
| 31 | Darma | 23 | 63 |
| 32 | Eva | 23 | 50 |
| 33 | Gesli | 36 | 66 |
| Total | | 1251 | 1987 |
| Mean | | 37.90 | 60.21 |
| Mean Difference | | 22.29 | |

2.2 Data Analyzing and Processing

In analyzing the data the researcher made it from the pre test and post test score. The result is shown in table 4. From the result of the pre test it was found that the highest score for the GTM group was 63 and the lowest was 23, where the highest score of post test was 80 and the lowest was 40. For the Eclectic group, the highest score of pre test was 60 and the lowest score was 20, where for the Post Test, the highest was 83 and the lowest was 30. The mean of Pre test of GTM group was 37.92 and the mean of post test was 57.14. For the Eclectic group, the mean of pre test was 37.90 and the mean of post test was 60.21.

Table 7. Result

| | GTM | | Eclectic | |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | Pre test | Post test | Pre test | Post test |
| The highest Score | 63 | 80 | 60 | 83 |
| The lowest score | 23 | 40 | 20 | 30 |

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Mean | 37.92 | 57.14 | 37.90 | 60.21 |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

The results showed the improvement between pre test and post test.

I. Pre Test

a. Testing the mean:

The hypothesis:

H_0 = the result of pre test Grammar group was not significantly different from the result of pretest of Eclectic group.

To test the similarity of means the researcher used t test and the result was shown on table 5

Table 8. Pre test

| Grammar group | | | | Eclectic group | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Mean | Standard defiation | T | Df | Mean | Standard Deviation | t | Df |
| 37.92 | 9.70 | 20.31 | 26 | 37.90 | 10.89 | 20.01 | 32 |

a. Finding the Equal Variances

To find the equal variances, the test was done by using F test, and the hypothesis was:

Both of the pretest variances were similar

The criteria: H_0 is rejected if $F_{\text{observed}} > F_{\text{table}} = F_{\alpha; df 1; df 2}$

For $\alpha = 0.05$ and $df1=26$ and $df2=32$.

From F_{table} , it was found that:

$F_{\text{table}} = 0.05: 26: 32 = 1.89$.

Because $F_{\text{observed}} < F_{\text{table}}$, ($1.015 < 1.89$) It was obtained that H_0 is accepted. It means that the variances of the pretest of both groups are equal.

b. Testing the mean

The criteria was: H_0 is rejected if $T_{\text{observed}} > T_{\text{table}} = t_{\alpha; df}$ with an assumption that the test variances of both group were equal.

$T_{\text{observed}} =$

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

$$t = \frac{37.92 - 37.90}{\sqrt{\frac{(20.318)^2}{27} + \frac{(20.01)^2}{30}}}$$

$$t = 0.02$$

From the calculation above it was obtained that

$T_{\text{observed}} = 0.02$, $\alpha = 0.05$ and $df = 58$

From t_{table} it was obtained that $t_{\text{table}} = 0.05:58 = 1.645$

Because of the result showed that $t_{\text{observed}} < t_{\text{table}}$ ($0.02 < 1.645$) then H_0 is accepted, it means that the means of GTM group was not significantly different from the Eclectic group.

1. Post Test

TO find the result of the research, the researcher found the gain scores, gain score was obtained from the difference between post test and pre test score.

Table 9. Post Test

| Grammar Group | | | | | Eclectic Group | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-------|----|-------|----------------|-----------|-------|----|-------|
| Mean | Standard | T | DF | Gain | Mean | Standard | T | DF | Gain |
| | Deviation | | | | | deviation | | | |
| - ; 4 | 11.29 | 26.30 | 26 | 19.23 | 60.21 | 15.05 | 22.09 | 32 | 22.31 |

a. Finding the Equal Variances

Testing the equal variances was done by F test, the hypothesis were: H_1 ; Gain variances of both groups are different.

Criteria: H_0 is rejected if $F_{\text{observed}} > F_{\text{table}} = (\alpha; df_1; df_2)$

To find the F_{observed} , the researcher used the formula:

$$F_{\text{observed}} = \frac{\text{The highest variances}}{\text{The lowest variances}}$$

$$S^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

$$s_1^2 = \frac{1}{n_1 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

$$s_2^2 = \frac{1}{n_2 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

$$S1^2 = \frac{1}{N_1 - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n1} (x_i - \bar{x})^2$$

$$S1^2 = \frac{1}{26} \sum_{i=1}^{27} (22.31 - 19.23)^2$$

$$S1^2 = \frac{1}{26} 0.9864$$

$$S1^2 = 0.36$$

$$S1 = 0.6$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_2^2 &= \frac{1}{32} \sum_{i=1}^{33} (19.32 - 22.31)^2 \\ &= 27.9 \\ s_2^2 &= 28 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \frac{28}{0.6} \\ f &= 46.6 \end{aligned}$$

From the calculation above it was obtained that:

$F_{\text{observed}} = 46.6$ with $\alpha = 0.05$ and $df_1 = 26$ $df_2 = 32$

From F_{table} , it was obtained that:

$F_{\text{table}} = (0.05:26:32) = 1.84$

The result shows that $F_{\text{observed}} > F_{\text{table}}$ ($46.6 > 1.84$) then H_0 was rejected.

It means that the variances of gain of both data were different.

b. Testing the mean

Testing the mean was done by using t test

Criteria: H_0 is rejected if $t_{\text{observed}} > t_{\text{table}}$

The researcher found the t_{observed} based on the formula:

$$t = \alpha(v)$$

$$t = 0.05(v)$$

$$v = (n1 - 1) + (n2 - 2)$$

$$v = (27 + 1) + (34 - 2)$$

$$v = 26 + 32$$

$$v = 58$$

$$t = 0.05(58)$$

$$t = 2.9$$

Based on the calculation above it was obtained that;

$$t_{\text{observed}} = 2.9$$

From the t_{table} it was obtained that $t_{\text{table}} = (0.05:58) = 1.645$

The result show that $t_{\text{observed}} > t_{\text{table}}$ ($2.9 > 1.645$) then H_0 is rejected. It can be concluded that the mean of gain of Eclectic group was higher than the mean of Grammar group.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research was done for about 3 months, and the treatment was implemented in 16 meetings. At the end the result shows a significant difference between pre test and post test. At the time the pretest was conducted, both groups were in the same level of vocabulary which could be seen on the result that the rate of score was almost same, the Grammar group had 37.92 and Eclectic group had 37.90 mean of scores. But after the treatment was implemented, the result showed that the group which was taught by using Eclectic method got a higher score rather than the group which was taught by using Grammar Translation method which could be seen on the gain of the score that the Eclectic group had 23.31 and the range ability (mean) was 60.21 while the grammar group had 19.23 and 57.14 for the mean. Therefore, we can concluded that there is a significant difference of the students' ability who were taught by using Eclectic method and who were taught by using Grammar Translation Method. From the result above, it can be concluded that in fact the method of teaching has a big influence in learning process. The research also showed that almost all of the students in Eclectic group enjoyed learning English. They enjoyed and had fun because of the pictures, games, songs and the *realia* that were being part of the teaching.

Based on the research, the researcher found that Eclectic method has some advantages, they were:

1. The method was in accordance with the need of the students.
2. The students were free from the boredom.
3. The students felt easier to remember the vocabulary due to the pictures and the songs.
4. The class became enjoyable and interesting to the students and the teacher.

To answer the question which was presented in the statement of the Problem that is there any significant difference in the vocabulary achievement of the students who were taught by using Grammar translation method and Eclectic Method? The researcher drew the conclusion as follows:

1. There was a significant difference in the vocabulary achievement of students who were taught by using Eclectic method and GTM, which could be seen on the gain of the score that the Eclectic group had 23.31 and the (mean) was 60.21 while the gain of the score of GTM group was 19.23 and 57.14 for the mean.
2. Compared with GTM, the researcher found that Eclectic method was more suitable in teaching language to the early age students. This method required the teacher to be competent in using the method that she is going to use, whereas the creativity of the teacher also plays an important role.
3. Eclectic method was suitable for both small and big classes. But with the smaller population of the students the learning activities will become more effective and the achievement will be better.
4. Eclectic method could make the students increase their knowledge by presenting the pictures and interesting *realia* to the students.

1. Based on the fact, the researcher recommend to the teacher of elementary school to use the Eclectic method as an alternative method because the researcher found that Eclectic method could increase the students' achievement more than GTM.

To the next researcher, it is expected that there will be further research on this type that will consider for a longer period of time in order to find out more significant result.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R.C., Hiebert, E.H., Scott, J.A., & Wilkinson, I.A.G. (1985) . *Becoming a nation of readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Anthony, H.M & Raphael, T.E. (1996) . Using Questioning Strategies to promote students' active reading comprehension of content area material. In D. Lapp, J. Flood, & N. Farnan (Eds.), *Content area reading learning: Instructional strategies* (pp. 307-322). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Ariko, Suharsini. (1998) . *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Armbruster, B., Lehr, F., & Osborn, J. (2001) . *Put reading first: The reseach building blocks for teaching children to read*. Washington, DC: The U.S Department of Education.

Brown, D. (1994) . *Teaching by Principles: An interactive approach of language pedagogy*.

Buehl, D. (1994) . *Classroom strategies for interactive learning, 2nd edition*. Newmark, Delaware: International Reading Association. Available at: www.itrc.ucf.edu

Cooper David. (1993) . *Literacy: Helping Children Construct Meaning*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L.R., Sivan, E., Rackliffe, G., Book, C., Meloth, M.S., rt al. (1987) . Effects of explaining the reasoning associated with using reading strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 22(3),374-368.

Duke, N. & Pearson, D. (2002), Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In fastrup, A. & Samuels, S. (Ed.) *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp.205-242). Newmark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Fitzgerald, J. (1983) . Helping Readers gain self-control over reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 37 (2), 249-253.

Guszak, F. J. (1967) . teacher questioning and reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 21, 227-34.

Long, J. D. m& Long, E. W. (1987) . Enhancing student achievement through metacomprehension training. *Journal of Development Education*, 11 (1), 2-5.

Malena, R. F. & Atwood Coker, K. J. (1987) . Reading comprehension: The missing elements. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 10(3), 24-25,35.

McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., Omanson, R. C., & People, M. T. (1985) . Some effects of the nature and frequency of vocabulary instruction on the knowledge and use of words. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 552-535. Available at: <http://www.prel.org/products>

Mesmer, H. & Hutchins, E. (2002) . Using QAR's with Charts and Graphs [Electronic Version]. *The Reading Teacher*, 56, 21-27.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). (2000) . Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups. (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Pearson, P. D. (1985) . Changing the face of reading comprehension instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 38(8), 726-737.

Pressley, M. (September, 2001) . Comprehension instruction: What makes sense now, and what make sense soon. *Reading Online*, 5(2). Available at: http://readingonline.org/articles/art_index.asp?HREF=/articles/handbook/pressley/index.html

Rand report, Reading for understanding. (2002)

Raphael, T. (1986) . Teaching question answer relationships, revisited. *The Reading Teacher* (39) 6, 516-522.

Raphael, T. E. (1984) . Teacher explanations and students' understanding of sources of information for answering questions. In J. A. Niles & L. A. Harris (Ed.) Changing Perspectives on Research in Reading/ Language Processing and Instruction. Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

Raphael, T. E. & Pearson, P. D. (1985) . Increasing students' awareness of sources of information for answering questions. American Educational Research Journal, 22, 217-236.

Raphael, T. E. & Wannacott, C. A. (1985) . Heightening 4th grade students' sensitivity to sources of information for answering questions. Reading Research Quarterly, 20(3), 282-296.

Raphael, T. E. & McKinney, J. (1983) . An examination of 5th and 8th grade children's questioning answering behavior: An instructional study in metacognition. Journal of Reading Behavior, 15, 67-86.

Richard, J. C. Platt. Heidi and Platt. John. 1992. *Longman: Dictionary of Language Teaching And Applied Linguistics*. England: Burnt Mill, Harlow.

Roth, F. Speece, D., & Cooper, D., (2002) . A longitudinal Analysis of the Connection Between Oral Language and Early Reading [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 95, 259-72.

Strucker, J. & Davidson, R. (2003). *NCSALL research brief: Adult reading components study (ARCS)*, Boston, MA: National Center for the study of Adult Learning and Literacy. Available from: <http://ncsall.gse.harvard.edu/publication.html>

Torgesen, J., Alexander, A., & Wagner, T. (2001) . Intensive Remedial Instruction for Children with Severe Reading Disabilities; Immediate and Long-term Outcomes from Two Instructional Approaches [Electronic version]. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 34, 33-58.

Underwood, T. (1997). On knowing what you know: Metacognition and the act of reading. *The Clearing House*. 71(2), 77-80.

Vaughn, S., Klinger, J., Bryant, K., & Pedrotty, D. (2001). Collaborative Strategic Reading as a Means to Enhance Peer-Mediated Instruction for Reading Comprehension and Content-Area Learning [Electronic version]. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22, 67-74.

Vidal-Abarca, E., Martinez, G., & Gilabert, R. (2000), Two Procedures to Improve Instructional Text: Effects on Memory and Learning [Electronic version]. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 107-116.

Wade, S. E. (1990) . Using think aloud to assess comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 43(7), 442-451.

Walker, B. (2000). *Diagnostic Teaching of Reading: Techniques for instruction and assessment* (4th ed.) New Jersey: Merrill.

Yopp, R. E. (1988) . “Questioning and Active Comprehension.” *Questioning Exchange*, 2, 231-238.

<http://www.curry.edschool.virginia.edu> (FOR-PD’s Reading Strategy of the month)

<http://www.readingrocketsorg/firstyear/fyt.php?CAT=40> (Answering Question)

http://www.readwritethink.org/lessons/lesson_view.asp?id=232 (Using QARs to Develop comprehension and reflective reading habits.

<http://justreadnow.com> (Question – Answer Relationship)